AN HON. MEMBER: It is a very important subject.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is an important subject, no doubt about it.

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: महोदया, Business Advisory Committee में इसके लिए आज ही का दिन तय किया गया था। निश्चित रूप से यह ऐसा विषय है जिससे पूरे देश के नौजवान उद्वेलित हैं और प्रभावित भी हैं। अच्छा यह होता कि आज के दिन लिस्ट न करके इसको पहले किया जाता। लेकिन पहले चूंकि लेजिस्लेटिव बिजनेस को प्रायोरिटी दी गई, गवर्नमेंट बिजनेस को प्रायोरिटी दी गई, तो सरकार से सहमत होकर आज के दिन के लिए हम लोगों ने इसको तय किया। तो मैं सोचता हूं कि यह एक ऐसी समस्या है जिस पर हम सब को गंभीरता से राजनीति की परिधि से उपर उठकर न केवल विचार करना चाहिए बल्कि निदान निकालना चाहिए। इसलिए इस पर आज चर्चा किया जाना बहुत आवश्यक है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whether it is the fag end of a Session or the beginning of a Session, the discussion in the Parliament is as important on the first day as on the last day, till the last minute. It doesn't matter to Parliament. Whatever is spoken here or whatever is replied here and at whatever time it is taken, has the same importance. My only concern is, shall we go to seek clarifications? If we finish clarifications, if you agree Mr. Pachouri, then we will take unemployment. So that, at least, we can release some worry and may not be sitting all the time. So, we take up clarifications. Shri Santos Bagrodia, Prof. Saif-ud-Din Soz, and Shrimati N.P. Durga are not present. Dr. P.C. Alexander.

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE STATEMENT BY MINISTER REGARDING FIFTH MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE OF WTO AT CANCUN, MEXICO.

During 10—14 September, 2003.

DR. P.C. ALEXANDER (Maharashtra): Madam, Deputy Chairperson, the hon. Minister in this statement on the Cancun developments had described these developments as a disappointment. I would like to say that while it was a matter of disappointment that no consensus could emerge at Cancun, it is a matter of great satisfaction to us that no compromise was made on our national interest or the interest of developing countries at Cancun. Because of that, I think, instead of the Minister feeling disappointed he should feel really happy at the conclusions reached or at the absence of conclusions in Cancun. I would like to seek a few clarifications from the Minister. I was going through the document relating

to Cancun and I was somewhat disappointed at seeing a very brief Ministerial Statement, which is hardly half-a-page document. Normally, with my experience of attending this type of trade negotiation meetings in the past, normally the final Ministerial Statement is a very lengthy one giving directions to the officials, indicating the way further negotiations should be held. Perhaps the disappointment at the level of the Ministers was so great, because they could not reach agreement on Agriculture and on the Singapore issues, that they decided to end up the negotiations with a very brief Ministerial Statement? Or, is there something more in it? It is because they didn't want to admit the negotiations ended in total failure I am sure, the Minister who was a Member of that Ministerial Conference Group would like to give a clarification on this issue.

The second point on which I seek the Minister's clarification is that even in this very brief statement there is no reference to services. The two issues—Agriculture and the Singapore issues—so much dominated the discussion at Cancun that the final Ministerial Statement, which is generally considered to be a very, Comprehensive document, is conspicuously silent in its reference to services. I do not know whether services were discussed at all or further discussion on Services were left to the Council for Trade in Services which was to meet very shortly. I would like to have a clarification why the services sector does not find even a mention in the final statement of the Minister. I mention this point because in the strategy that we may adopt in the next stage of negotiations, we have to keep a difference between services, on the one side, and access to market for manufacturers and agriculture, on the other side. It is good that we could reach a consensus among the developing countries on issues relevant to agriculture and the Singapore issues. But, I would like to remind the House, and remind the Minister also, that when it comes to services, we may not be able to reach the consensus that we reached on Agriculture with other developing countries. I will go a step further and say that we should not feel disappointed if we are not able to reach a consensus with other developing countries. The point I am tryign to make is when it comes to services, our interests are, more or less, like those of the development countries. In fact, our future strategy in exports would heavily depend upon the services sector. Already 49 per cent of our GDP is contributed by services, while the share of agriculture and manufacturing is just half lakh of that. Therefore, in the future strategy, at the fourm of

the WTO and at the official level meetings that are to be held in Geneva, I hope the meetings are over at the official level, where we may not be that enthusiastic to arrive at a consensus among developing countries because very few developing countries have reached the level of sophistication and achievement which we have been able to make in the area of services whether it is communication or Information Technology or whether it is in higher education where we really stand on a level much higher than that of other developing countries. Therefore, I would like to get a clarification from the hon. Minister that the strategy that he very successfully pursued in Cancun regarding agriculture and Singapore issues, may not necessarily be followed when it comes to services in the other fora, because there we cannot hope to have the complete support of the developing countries.

My final point for clarification by the Minister is whether his strategy is to eliminated the Singapore issues from the agenda of the WTO or to delink the Singapore issue as the developed countries want and then debate each one of its merits and try to safeguard our interest. There is no harm even in trying to eliminate these issues although from the agenda of the WTO, if we can succeed in that attempt. Many issues, which dominated the discussions in the old UNCTAD have feded out. Very few people today would remember the big noise that was made about commodity issues the 60s, 70s and proposed for creating a Common Fund which slowly just faded out. I would like to know from the Minister as to what his strategy would be regarding the Singapore issues. Is it a strategy to see that this naver comes into the agenda or is it his strategy to let then be discussed in the forum of WTO and handle these item by item? These are the three points on which I would request the hon. Minister to give clarifications. One final word of advice like an elder in the field to the young, dynamic and very competent Minister. I am quoting his words. He said, "There is no final day in trade negotiations." This is very good point and a very good quotable quote. If that is kept in mind, quietly, we can succeed in contriving the death of the Singapore issues wihout having to discuss then. Once a subject is brought into the forum for discussion, it will be very difficult to kill it altogether. You may have to make compromises. On this issue, I would like to have a clarification from him. When he gives the reply. Thank you.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA (Rajasthan): Madam, Deputy Chairperson, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to seek clarifications.

There is no doubt that we have a very able Minsiter, and from the reports which we have been getting, he has been handling the Cancun conference very well. I wish some conclusions would have come, because the whole purpose of this conference was that we come to some conclusions so that the entire world can benefit which includes our country.

I am sure the hon. Minister knows why this WTO came into picture. The production capacity of all the developed countries in the world is very high for all different kind of items, and, their consumption levels have reached at such a high level that they do not find any more possibility of increasing that consumption level. So, these rich countries found out a way that they can export the surplus production to poor countries to Third-World countries, to smaller cuntries. So the best way they found out that let us have this WTO by which all barriers for movement of goods can be stopped.

In the process, as you know what has happened in India, number of agro-based industries other industries, specially, labour oriented industries, are either closed, or are on the verge of closure. What do we do in that situation? I know we cannot get out of this WTO. We cannot remain in isolation. Under those circumstances, I wonder whether the hon. Minister. I am sure, he must be discussing but still I would like to know has been talking about the movement of labour without any borders. If goods can be moved without borders, why should there not be any movement of labour. They say, like we will not take any rejected goods say, any fruits any steel or sub-standard thing, they can also say that we will not take people who have a black spot on their life. But they cannot refuse the entry of person if he absolutely clean, and there is nothing against him, and, he should be free to go there, work there, like anybody else.

I would like to know this particular clarification, and this includes the point which the hon. fellow Member, Dr. P.C. Alexander mentioned just before me regarding the movement of service. What is happening, Madam, when we talk about the call centres, I am told in USA, the USA Government has put some conditions on even call centres, which the USA companies have accepted the services in India. They have put the condition that they cannot use the call centres from India.

On the one hand, we talk about free trade. On the other, we are getting these kinds of conditions ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPTUY CHAIRMAN: I think, yesterday, or, on Friday, there was a question in which he clarified it.

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE AND MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI ARUN JAITELY): Yesterday.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yesterday only, he clarified it.

SHRI ARUN JAITELY: I will clarify it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will clarify it.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Okay, I will stand corrected if you clarify because this is what the people are reporting, and this is what is also coming in the newspapers. Madam, I am very happy that the Minister did not compromise while discussing even if the entire discussions finally failed. I dont know when are you going to have the next round of discussion. I would appreciate if I can know this? Because the earlier, the better so that we come to some conclusions. With these few points I conclude, and if I can get the clarifications, I will appreciate. Thank you.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Jammu and Kashmir): Madam Deputy Chairman, the Minister Mr. Arun Jaitley, has brought us credit and he piloted our case very ably, and at that point of time, we congratulated him for his performance at Cancun. Now, it is a very ticklish issue. His statement, Mr. Alexander said, was brief statement. But I find that it is a very brief and a very comprehensive statement. I do not find anything to add to the Minister's statement.

DR. P.C. ALEXANDER: I am sorry, Madam Deputy Chairman, I was referring to the Ministerial Conference statement at Cancun and not the Minister's statement in this House.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN-SOZ: I am sorry. This is a brief but comprehensive statement. The Minister himself admits that it is a very protracted process, very difficult and a very complicated area. I know the kind of pressure he must have felt at Cancun. Therefore, for future, we wish him well. I would ask the Minister would he consider preparing himself? Already he has done it very ably, but for future, because he says that this whole process is protracted, he has to be doubly sure because he has to face a very difficult situation. Firstly, I would say that we should be cautious of the U.S.A. and other developed countries. They meet at these international conferences. I would like to remind the hon. Minister that I had the privilege of leading the Indian delegation at Kyoto for the Cop-III

Conference. I know at that point of time, we had so many discussions with experts here. The Cabinet had taken a decision. But the U.S.A. was so active at Kyoto that apart from the Government delegation, there was a delegation of 200 people and they were representing what was in those days known as climage coalition. The General Motors and some oil companies had sent 200 people to wreck the Kyoto protocol. At that point of time and earlier also, I had been to New York, when I found the then President Clinton, convincing his society that because of warmer days, climate change is a reality and global warming is there. He referred to some deficient Chicago and he was trying to convince American society. It is because some oil companies and General Motors are very active in America, they had to respond to that and they tride to wreck the Kyoto Protocol. But I must say, at that point of time, among other developing countries, G-7 and G 7+1, China and India came together and therefore, Kyoto Protocol was adopted. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether there is any mechanism in shape for developing countries to consult each other. I do not know whether on this question, for instance, china and India could go together. We have to protect our national interest. But is there any mechanism in shape so that the developing countries face the situation together as G-7 tried to do at Kyoto in 1997? Then, I would say that we have a lot of experts here, I think the hon. Minister has done that exercise, but there is no harm if, before attending any future conference, he invites the experts from our universities and sits with them. Not for clarity of ideas only, but one feels a lot of strength when one sees a lot of support. So many minor things can come to his notice also. Then I would also like to know, he has mentioned, for instance, about development. The U.S.A. is not interested in our development. On the question of climate change and environment, they will be never with us. Development is our concern, not the concern of the development world. So, on that point, we have to be very strong for future. We are at this point very strong. But, we have to feel doubly sure for future. Therefore, I would also like to know from the hon. Minister whether he would like to organise a meeting with the national Opposition because, on this point, we were with him and he was good at Cancun. We shall be with him because these are laudable ideas, how he will protect India's interests. But this is a national question. So, I would like to know whether he will consult the national Opposition on this question and have a comprehensive meeting with the national Opposition. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chavan, do you have still something to question?

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ CHAVAN (Maharashtra): Madam, just three or four points only.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As everybody has prepared the ground, now you have to put only questions.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ CHAVAN: Madam, I agree with the Minister that this was a stocktaking Ministerial Conference and no major agreement was expected at Cancun. But I still share his disappointment over two crucial areas, which were very important from India's point of view. One is freeing distortions in the agricultural markets caused by large-scale subsidies. There was no movement on that at all and also the pending implementation issues from the Uruguay Round. We had fought hard to get agreement on in Doha. We failed to get any timeframe for resolving implementation issues. So, on these two issues, I share his disappointment. I had also heard newspaper reports when the Minister was reported to have said that no agreement is better than a bad agreement. But I think from the Uruguay Round days, there were distortions which needed to be corrected and Cancun would have been an opportunity to move forward on freeing the agricultural distortions and agricultural subsidisation, which were very crucial to our agricultural economy. We did not make any movement on that. Implementation issues were also pending. I specifically would like to ask the Minister regarding Press reports that on the last day India was prepared to concede discussing two of the four Singapore issues, particularly transparency in the Government procurement and trade facilitation. Is that a fact? Because if India had taken that stand to start discussing the four Singapore issues in return for certain movement on agricultural side, then perhaps this unity of G-16 that you had on the Singapore issues would have been broken. Of course, at this stage, I must compliment the Minister for playing a very important role in forgoing the unity of G-20 along with Brazil and China, which really redefined the way the WTO negotiations will go on in future. I really congratulate him for that. My specific question is: Is there any possibility of major Ministerial Conference at Hong Kong next year in order to move the Doha Agenda forward? What does he mean by the General Council meeting before 15th December at the senior officer level? Has that taken

place, because 15th December 2003 has already gone? Is there any movement and what are the timeframes that we can look forward to now on the area of agriculture and implementation issues? Thank you, Madam.

5.00 P.M.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the Minister will reply.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Madam, I am very grateful to the hon. Members for the views that they have expressed and for that they have raised some very important questions. I may, at the very outset, mention in response to what Professor Soz has said, that even before Cancun, the Government had had wide consultations with all national political parties, the Indian industry, with experts, with trade unions, with farmers' organisations and with almost all stakeholders on the subject. I have said this earlier also, and I have no hesitation in saying this that the nuances of the stand put forward by various groups may have been different from one another, but the core points on WTO, and India's approach to WTO were more or less identical amongst various views which were expressed. And it was this national consensus, which also represents one of India's great strengths when we entered into multilateral negotiations. Several important questions have been raised and Dr. Alexander has raised the issue why there was a brief Ministerial text. It would obviously take a long explanation, if I go into all the reasons. I give you a brief idea of why there was only a short Ministerial text. Prior to Cancun, a group of almost 30 countries, representing various interests had a series of about 4 to 5 mini-Ministerial Conferences and we were trying to see if some convergence in our stands was possible. At Cancun, we were faced initially before Cancun with a text on agriculture, which was prepared, by the United States and the European Union. This text was declared by them on the 13th of August, about three weeks before Cancun. This text, broadly disregarded the concerns of the developing and a large number of least developed countries. In terms of reduction of subsidies, there was a very marginal movement which the EU and the US text really dealt with. And in terms of market access by developing countries, it wanted us to make very wide compromises. This, certainly, would have compromised India's interests very adversely, as also the interests of several other developing countries. And it was as a response to this that the G-20 was really formed. The G-20 came out with its text in response to agriculture on the 20th of August itself. And, therefore, Cancun was confronted with these two divergent approaches. The first four days in Cancun in the Ministerial conference

were spent really on working out some arragement, if it was possible, on agriculture ifself. There was no other subject which was discussed. And, finally, on the fourth day—it was a five-day Conference—there was a detailed text which came out. Of course, there were different Groups which were working on non-agricultural market access, Groups working on the Singapore issues and various other issues. India had been instrumental, along with some other developing countries, in forming the G-20 Alliance, so far as agriculture was concerned, and the G-16 Alliance, which Mr. Chavan has just now referred to, so far as the Singapore issues were concerned. On the 13th, that is the fourth day when the Chairman's text came, we were surprised to see that the Chairman's text did not reflect the larger consensus which was emerging, as far as the Conference was concerned. Now, the Doha Declaration had, specifically, referred to the Singapore issues, that modalities could be settled on the basis of explicit consensus which could be reached. Therefore, the Doha Declaration mandated an explicit consensus where all the 148-member countries had to say a positive yes, before modalities could begin. Now, G-16 itself was opposed to it. G-16 wanted a further clarificatory process to go on. On the 11th, I had addressed a letter, on behalf of, initially, 29 countries, which, later, became 69 countries, which said, "We are not willing to start negotiations or modalities on these issues." Now, a large membership of the WTO was expressing itself against those issues. And, finally, it was not only the 69 countries but when the oral opinions were being expressed, the figure could well have been in three digits. Therefore, there was a large membership which was opposed to starting negotiations, but the text, unfortunately, mentioned that negotiations or modalities would begin on the issue of investment, on the issue of transparency in public procurement and on the issue of trade facilitation. The only issue left out for negotiations or modalities in the draft text was on the Competition Policy. Particularly, it was relevant in the context of the United States, which itself was reluctant to begin the modalities on that issue. Therefore, what most of the developing countries had said on this issue was completely disregarded.

Similarly, on agriculture, in terms of export subsidies,—there are three pillars for the agricultural negotiations—finally, in the negotiations along with the draft, there was some movement, which was indicated. The European Union, particularly, indicated that it was prepared to bring down, and, eventually, eliminate export subsidies, over a period of time, on products of interest to developing countries. But, it insisted on a parallelism

that the United States would also end its subsidies on exports in different types of credit that it gives. If only one eliminates it, we will also start eliminating it. There was a minor dilution of the Doha Agenda even as far as the export subsidy is concerned. But, on domestic support subsidies, the United States, broadly, was standing by the Farm Bill, which they passed last year. And the European Union had a common agricultural policy in June this year. Therefore, in terms of substantial reduction, there was not much reduction. Of course, there was some shifting of boxes from one category of trade distorting subsidies to what they regarded as lesser trade distorting or non-trade distorting, something on which the developing countries had a lot of apprehensions. So, in terms of reduction of subsidies, the movement was not much. But, in terms of market access in developing countries, they wanted some of the tariffs in developing countries to be brought down on the basis of what is not the Uruguay-round formulation. But the Swiss Formula cut would have made much deeper cuts. In effect, it would have meant—we made some calculations with the assistance of the economists who were assisting us there—that the developed countries would have had much lesser reduction in terms of agricultural tariffs and the developing countries would be expected to make far deeper cuts in terms of even market access. This is precisely what prompted us to say that the developmental agenda, if this is the approach, really is not encouraged by this draft text. India, of course, was in the forefront of rejecting this draft text. Then, we were faced with a situation, both on the Singapore issues and on the agricultural issues, where there were clearly divergent views. In the greenroom, on the last day, what we discussed really was only the Singapore issues. The discussion on the agricultural issues did not start. Since you have asked about this, and Mr. Chavan has also raised this question whether we are prepared to make some further movements, in the course of the discussion, the European Union, on the issue of investment and on the issue of Competition Policy, showed some flexibility. The decision was inconclusive. India, of course, opposed. Some of the G-16 Members had indicated the kind of flexibility that they had. India had indicated at that stage that we had very little flexibility and, therefore, we wanted further clarifications even on the remaining two issues. We wanted to watch the outcome of all other issues and we wanted clarifications on these issues, before we could move further on this matter. But at that stage some countries belonging to the African Group said that even those two balance issues,

as far as they are concerned, were not negotiable. Since they were opposed to that, this you must note, there was a very significant move in the stand of several countries from Doha to Cancun, because in Doha when this requirement of exclusive consensus was added—this was when India was represented by Shri Maran who singularly insisted on this—we were, at one stage, almost alone. But at this stage, a large number of countries were with us, as far as these issues are concerned. Therefore, without even discussing the agricultural issues in the greenroom, the Conference was called off. India had thought that since on the Singapore issues there had been some movements, we could, perhaps, make some more movement on those Singapore issues, which we discussed for further clarification, and, perhaps, we had to watch what would be the outcome, as far as the agricultural discussions were concerned. Since those discussions did not take place, no consensus could be reached. The only option left with the Chairman of the Conference, who is a very widely respected and experienced person, perhaps, in his wisdom thought that no consensus would be possible. So, he called the Conference off and the larger Assembly was called and a short statement was, therefore, issued stating, "We have failed to have a declaration, but we will attempt, on the basis of all drafts which have been prepared so far, to work for further consensus, as far as these issues are concerned". It is in this background that you had a short statement rather than a large statement because there was no consensus, as far as the large statement itself is concerned.

On the Singapore issues, since you have raised a specific query on these issues, yes, at that stage, the European Union had given indications, as far as two of the issues are concerned. In the present round those issues are not there. We had further discussions with the European Union. Recently, in Brasillia, I had an opportunity to meet the Trade Commissioner of the European Union and we further discussed these trade issues. So far, there does not seem to be any further movement on these issues, which is taking place. You raised a very important question as to whether there was discussion with regard to services. You are absolutely right, as far as services are concerned. I think, over the last few years, there is a radical change in the situation, as far as India's domestic economy as also our approach towards these issues are concerned. India in certain segment of its service sector is particularly proactive. Now, we are proactive, as far as Mode-I of the services is concerned. That is what

Santoshji has just now referred to as "the whole BPO issue". I may just clarify that as far as service sector is concerned, it is not only the BPO issue but there are several segments also. Tourism would be services. Medical or healthcare would be sercies. Now, patients are coming to India. That is also part of the service sector. Professional services would be services. There are a very large number of services which are covered under this. Now, there are two issue where we are particularly proactive. One is relating to Mode-I which is the electronic mode of discharging services becasue that is where we found great competence in India and we are in a position to supply the world with quality services at a very reasonable price in view of the large human resource in our population, the knowledge resource that we have been able to create, in relation to movement of persons.

That is what some of the Members referred to as the movement of labour, which Santoshji just now referred to. Now, this issue itself has several connotations. In certain economies, it has political sensitivities; issues relating to visas, issues relating to immigration are also involved. At Cancun, nothing specifically was even on the agenda as far as servcies are concerned. We could have discussed it. But the services negotiation process has been parallely on. Since Cancun was a midway point between Doha and Hongkong, in the Doha Round itself to discuss the further progress, the services agenda and time-table had been separately determined, as a part of which countries had made their offers, countries had made their requests as to various sectors that they were interested in. We have received offers from various countries. We ourselves have made requests. We have had a process of consultation with various stake-holders as far as India is concerned and that process is parallely going on. Once we are able to bilaterally come to certain arrangements with some countries, it will then multilaterally apply to us—those areas where we decide to open out; where our economies decide to open out. You are absolutely right that this is a very important area. But, then, we must remember—and I think there is no person better suited than Mr. Pranab Mukherjee because when he, in 1994, had entered into these initial arrangements, the pressures on the Indian economy were of a different kind—today there are many other sectors in the economy where we feel that the opening out itself is far beneficial as far as we are concerned, for the services sector which you just now pointed out. But we have to keep

in mind that when we negotiate on those issues, just as this time one of our great strengths has been the presence of a large national consesus which backed us, even in future, one of the lessons has to be that we cannot keep our negotiators always under pressure. There will always be a time when negotiators will have to have a policy of given and take. There are some sectors, even, for instance, services, where for a large benefit to the economy, you may have to make adjustments in some other areas, because those who give us those concessions may expect some reciprocity, as far as those areas are concerned. And I think this could be best left to really the wisdom and experience as far as our negotiators today, or, our negotiators in future were concerned.

Shri Chavan mentioned about some of the issues which were not really taken up. He is absolutely right that issues like the implementation issues, or, the special and differential treatment issues, are issues of great concern to the developing countries. Unfortunately, what happened after Doha was that there were two separate time-tables which were being followed. When it came to Singapore issues, which are of interest to the bigger economies, the richer countries, the issues were being pushed through with great speed. When it came to issues of market access, there was a tendency to push these issues with greater speed. And, when it came to the issues of interest to developing countries, such as, the implementation issues, or, the issues of special and differential treatment, the timetable would always be in a slower motion; and a large number of developing countries—China, India, Brazil, South Africa—have, now, very loudly started expressing their resentment over these issues. And, this was done at Cancun. This has also been done subsequently. What happens, now? The G-20 had a meeting, about ten days ago, on the 12th of this month, at Brasilia. I myself had gone there and participated in that meeting. Nineteen of the G-20 Members were present there. All the major participants in the G-20 had been there. And, the harmonisation of divergent interests within G-20, which we have achieved, has been rediscussed; and we stand by that. The Director-General of the WTO, Dr. Supuchai was there; Dr. Pascal Lamy was there. We had separate sessions with them also. Therefore, the G-20 stands together to discuss these various issues. There have been informal consultations in Geneva with the heads of delegations. After those informal consultations of the 15th December, there were formal consultations. In the formal consultations, most countries

had stood by with what there respective stand in Cancum was. Therefore, now, that activity has temporarily come to a lull or a standstill because of the vacation period. After that, sometimes in January, some of the issues would again be referred back to the various groups in Geneva, which would discuss those issues, and from there, it would start. The important question would be: Will we be able to meet the timetable of 1st January, 2005 for implementation of some of the major decisions of Doha? We do hope that it is possible because implementation of the development agenda is in our interest. But with the kind of divergent stands, today for us to categorically believe that that would be possible—even though we hope that it is possible—perhaps, I cannot say for certainly what would really happen. But, even when we express our disappointment that we could not produce a result and we said that the Cancun itself had failed, but I am still constrained to believe that G-20 did not fail, the stand of the developing countries did not fail. Therefore, Cancun marked a changing process where there was a singificant say which the developing countries have acquired in the multilateral process, and we do hope that the richer countries are able to recognise the shift in the decision-making process which has also taken place. Thank you, Madam.

MATTERS RAISED WITH PERMISSION OF CHAIR— RE ATTACK ON THE OFFICES OF ZEE AND ALFA NEWS IN MUMBAI

श्री लालू प्रसाद (बिहार): उपसभापति महोदया, 'जी' टीवी के साथ जो दुर्व्यवहार हुआ, पिटाई हुई, होम मिनिस्टर साहब को जानकारी देने के लिए कहा जाए। चूंकि यह विषय उनके विभाग से संबंधित है, इसलिए उनको बुला लिया जाए। हम लोग उनको सुनना चाहते हैं कि वे क्या एक्शन करने जा रहे हैं। ...(व्यवधान)... हम आदर करते हैं इनका, लेकिन 'जी' टीवी के साथ जो हुआ है, यह मामला होम से संबंधित है। यह मुम्बई में 'जी' टीवी के साथ इतना हुआ, महिलाओं को पीटा गया, और वहां कितनी सारी बातें हुईं, तो यह कैसे चलेगा? देश कैसे चलेगा? मैडम, देश टूट रहा है। कल भी उधर शिव सेना ने तोड़-फोड़ की और आज फिर यह बात हो रही है। आप होम मिनिस्टर साहब को बुला लीजिए। फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब को इसमें बीच में क्यों डाल रहे हैं? होम मिनिस्टर साहब को यहां रहना चाहिए, उनको बुला लीजिए। हम लोग उन्हें सुनना चाहते हैं।

उपसभापति: यह सरकार पर डिपेंड करेगा कि वह किसको कहे कि वह मंत्री बोल दें।

श्री लालू प्रसाद: नहीं, मैडम। हम सरकार से मांग करेंगे, होम मिनिस्टर साहब को यहां रहना चाहिए और यहां आकर बात करनी चाहिए। आप उन्हें बुला लीजिए। हमें बताया जाए कि मीडिया पर यह कैसे चारों तरफ हमला हो रहा है। बिहारियों पर तो हो ही रहा था, मीडिया के ऊपर भी शुरू